



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,529	02/01/2001	Seong-Min Park	678-562 (P9449)	2261
7590	08/09/2004			EXAMINER LE, LANA N
Paul J. Farrell, Esq. DILWORTH & BARRESE 333 Earle Ovington Boulevard Uniondale, NY 11553			ART UNIT 2685	PAPER NUMBER 748
DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/775,529	PARK ET AL.
	Examiner Lana N Le	Art Unit 2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5, 10 and 11 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 6-9 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \*    c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-5, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cushman et al (US 6,125,287).

Regarding claim 1, Cushman et al discloses a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, comprising the steps of: detecting whether or not a user has inputted a key (col 3, lines 10-19); detecting whether or not the user has consecutively inputted the same key before elapse of a predetermined time period for consecutive input (col 3, lines 23-27); if so, performing a newly set function according to the consecutive input of the same key (col 3, lines 23-27).

However, Cushman et al didn't specifically disclose:

wherein the newly set function is a phone directory function. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the menu function of Cushman for the phone directory function in order to allow the user to change any type of menu function and not necessarily just a phone directory function since a phone directory function is only one of the many type of phone

functions taught by Cushman in which pressing the same key again will change the screen to a different menu screen with a different function assignment which can include a phone directory function.

Regarding claim 2, Cushman further discloses the key input method of claim 1, further comprising a step of performing an original function of the inputted key when the user has not consecutively inputted the same key before elapse of the predetermined time period for consecutive input (col 3, lines 10-19).

Regarding claim 3, Cushman further discloses the key input method of claim 1, wherein the key is one of a plurality of alphanumeric keys in the mobile telecommunication terminal (col 4, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 4, Cushman further discloses the key input method of claim 1, wherein the key is one a plurality of functional keys in the mobile telecommunication terminal (col 3, lines 10-19).

Regarding claim 5, Cushman et al discloses a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, comprising:

detecting whether or not a user has inputted a key set for a calling function when displaying a menu screen comprising a called number directory (col 6, lines 14-21);

if so, detecting whether or not the input state of the key set for a call function is maintained for a predetermined period of time (col 6, lines 18-34); and

controlling the position of a cursor positioned at a particular item of the displayed screen depending on maintenance of the key input state for the predetermined period of time by changing the function from highlighting or selecting the telephone number to

dialing the telephone number when the same key is maintained for a period of time (col 6, lines 18-34).

Cushman et al didn't specifically disclose: a scrolling function.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the scrolling function for the dialing function in order to allow the user the option depending on the phone's design preferences to change to a scrolling function instead of a dialing function after maintaining the function key for a predetermined time interval in order to optionally allow the user to scroll the list of different types of phone numbers, ie. work, home, etc. associated with a person's name rather than a dialing function programmed within that one function key when it is held for a predetermined interval.

Regarding claim 10, Cushman et al further discloses the key input method of claim 5, wherein the key set for a scroll function is one of a plurality of alphanumeric keys in the mobile telecommunication terminal (col 3, lines 48-50).

Regarding claim 11, Cushman et al further discloses the key input method of claim 5, wherein the key set for a scroll function is one of a plurality of functional keys in the mobile telecommunication terminal (col 3, lines 43-47).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Claims 6-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 6, Cushman discloses the key input method of claim 5, wherein Cushman discloses the controlling step comprises the following sub-steps if the menu screen comprises a scroll screen of upward and downward directions (col 6, lines 15-16); wherein cited prior art fails to further disclose:

moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to a downward menu item when the key input state is not maintained for the predetermined period of time; and moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to an upward menu item when the key input state is maintained for the predetermined period of time.

Regarding claim 7, Cushman further discloses the key input method of claim 5, wherein cited prior art fails to further disclose the method further comprising the sub-steps of:

moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to an upward menu item when the key input state is not maintained for the predetermined period of time; moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to a downward menu item when the key input state is maintained for the predetermined period of time.

Regarding claim 8, Cushman further discloses the key input method of claim 5, wherein the cited prior art fails to further disclose the controlling step comprises the

following sub-steps if the menu screen comprises a scroll screen of left and right directions:

moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to a right menu item when the key input state is not maintained for the predetermined period of time; and

moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to a left menu item when the key input state is maintained for the predetermined period of time.

Regarding claim 9, Cushman further discloses the key input method of claim 5, wherein the cited prior art fails to further disclose the method further comprising the sub-steps of:

moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to a left menu item when the key input state is not maintained for the predetermined period of time; moving and displaying the cursor of the menu item to a right menu item when the key input state is maintained for the predetermined period of time.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lana Le whose telephone number is (703) 308-5836. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (703) 305-4385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.



Lana Le

June 23, 2004